

New claims

New claim 53 depends from claim 1, and further recites that the pipette tip is tapered. New claim 53 is supported, for example, by the pipette tip of Figure 1. This feature further distinguishes the present invention over the Ruediger patent.

New claim 54 depends from claim 1, and further recites that the constricted passage has a fixed cross-section. New claim 54 is supported, for example, by the constricted passage 220 of Figure 2. This feature further distinguishes the present invention over the Ruediger patent.

New claims 55, 58 and 61 depend from claims 1, 53 and 54, respectively, and further recite that as the pipette tip passes through the constricted passage, walls defining the pipette tip collapse inwardly such that liquid in the pipette tip of the first part is forced upward into the sample cup of the first part. This feature is supported by Figures 5A-5C, for example, and further distinguishes the present invention over the Ruediger patent.

New claims 56, 59 and 62 depend from claims 1, 53 and 54, respectively, and further recite that as the pipette tip passes through the constricted passage, walls defining the pipette tip collapse inwardly and form a moving liquid seal such that the moving liquid seal progresses up the pipette tip as the pipette tip passes through the constricted passage. This feature is supported

by Figures 5A-5C, for example, and further distinguishes the present invention over the Ruediger patent.


New claims 57, 58 and 63 depend from claims 1, 53 and 54, respectively, and further recite that as the pipette tip passes through the constricted passage, walls defining the pipette tip collapse inwardly and form a moving liquid seal such that the moving liquid seal progresses up the pipette tip as the pipette tip passes through the constricted passage, wherein the moving liquid seal forces liquid in the pipette tip upward into the sample cup. This feature is supported by Figures 5A-5C, for example, and further distinguishes the present invention over the Ruediger patent.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the applicant requests that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

December 11, 2002


John C. Pokotylo, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,242
Customer No. 26479
(732) 335-1222

STRAUB & POKOTYLO
1 Bethany Road
Suite 83
Hazlet, NJ 07730